

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

BRAD AMOS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	NO. 3:21-cv-00923
v.)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
)	
THE LAMPO GROUP, LLC, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Defendants have filed a motion to ascertain status (Doc. No. 96, “Motion”). The Motion is well-taken and is **GRANTED**. The Court is well aware of the pending dispositive motions in this case (Doc. Nos. 28, 30) and wishes to resolve them as soon as possible.

Nonetheless, the Court is attempting to deal with an large number of criminal cases (which take precedence over civil cases, as counsel presumably are aware), and is just now concluding the fourth week of a civil trial. In addition, the Court has more than 350 civil cases on its docket. The Court will make a determination on the dispositive motions as soon as possible, given the other pressing (and many of them older) matters pending before it. The Court can assure counsel that it is working diligently to minimize these sorts of delays to the full extent possible under the applicable circumstances.

Regarding “Defendants’ Objections to Memorandum Order (Doc. #66)” (Doc. No. 72, “Objections”), the Court denies the Objections without prejudice as noncompliant with Local Rule 72.01, which requires that objections filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) be styled as a “Motion for Review of Nondispositive Order of Magistrate Judge” and that a memorandum of law be separately filed. Defendants are welcome to refile their objections in a way such that they are compliant with Local Rule 72.01; provided that Defendants do so within fourteen days of the

docketing of the instant Order, such objections will be deemed timely and will be resolved by the Court as soon as feasible.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The requirements of Local Rule 72.01 are not meaningless formalities. They are helpful in flagging for the Court automatically, via the Court's electronic docketing and case management system, the fact that a decision from the district judge remains pending with respect to the review of the magistrate judge's ruling on a non-dispositive matter.